FELLOWSHIP

September 1945 Vol. XI—No. 9

Vindication and Responsibility

By JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

The Peril and Promise of Potsdam

By SAMUEL D. MARBLE

Report on Puerto Rico

By ALLAN KNIGHT CHALMERS AND JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

Labor Day Observations

By A. J. MUSTE

The Use of the Atomic Bomb

A STATEMENT BY 49 RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

" . . . Far from banishing war, the atomic bomb will in itself constitute a cause of war. In the absence of world government it will create universal fear and suspicion. Each nation will live nervously. . . . There is no comfort to be derived from the war-is-now-too-horrible theory. . . . Man must decide . . . what is more important—his differences or his similarities."

—NORMAN COUSINS, in *The Saturday Review of Literature*, Aug. 18, 1945.

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

WELL, THE END HAS COME. The end of Japan and of the war, and perhaps of the world. The immediate result of Hiroshima—victory and peace!—is so overwhelming that of course it monopolizes attention and exhausts emotion. It seems at last to prove that the end indeed justifies the means. But it is the final and not the immediate result that counts in these cases, and in this case the final result looms so terrible to any person of knowledge and imagination as to obliterate all consciousness of the present moment. For war has now completed itself. What began with the invention of the catapult has reached its climax in the release of the atomic bomb.

I

"War," wrote Edward Gibbon, in his immortal history, "is the art of extinguishing the human species." It has not been the fault of man, any lack of attention or effort on his part, that he has not been successful in the practise of this art. He has done the best he could with the lethal weapons at his command. Bows and arrows, spears, swords, flint-lock muskets, rifles, cannon, bombs—all these wreaked havoc, as far as they could. But they did not go very far. Killing in war remained at best a retail business. But now it has suddenly been made wholesale. Today it lies within the power of man to wipe out entire populations at one fell stroke. Extinction of the race is possible. Professor Hooton, of Harvard, has summed it all up, when he says, "To put into the hands of human beings as irresponsible as apes, and much more malicious, such a weapon as the atomic bomb, is to invite the destruction of civilization and the extinction of the human species."

It is argued, to be sure, that the possession of such power as is contained within this bomb, will sober man. He will see that war has become too terrible to be borne and, under the drive of sheer necessity, will do away with it. He will not dare, in other words, to handle a weapon so completely and horribly destructive. Especially will he refrain from releasing a blow so likely to redound upon himself, and thus achieve his own as well as his enemy's annihilation. Standing at last upon the very brink of hell, he will shrink back. And war will be no more!

All of which sounds fine—and means just nothing at all! For the most ghastly thing about this atomic bomb is that it was placed in the hands of men who did not hesitate to use it. President Truman and his advisors knew what this bomb could do. They knew that it could wipe out whole cities and their multitudinous civilians. They knew that it could cause such agony in human flesh as the world had never even imagined. They knew that the whole accumulation of Hitler's atrocities through five hideous years would not equal the sum total of this one blow. And surely they knew that this weapon had all the potentialities of a boomerang to strike this country later as now it struck the foe. But they knew also that this bomb gave us an instant and insuperable military advantage over Japan. This consideration outweighed in their minds every remoter contingency. So *they dropped the bomb!* For an immediate gain they risked chaos. Human nature, in other words, was tested—and succumbed. Man was tempted—and fell. What President Truman did yesterday heads of other governments, in like circumstances, may do tomorrow—until the world is as tenantless as the moon.

Professor Hooton laments that it will be impossible "to confine this dangerous knowledge only to the good. . . . Evil men," he says, "will seize upon it and use it in the future."

But it was not "evil men" who used it this first time! It was not Hitler and his Nazi gangsters, nor yet Mussolini and his fascist terrorists, who rained down this dreadful death upon mankind. Had they done so, we know what we would have said about such barbarism, savagery, and bestiality. No, it was the leaders of the United States, Britain, and Canada who did this thing more ferocious than Hitler ever did. It was "good" men, as the world recognizes goodness, the custodians of civilization, who seized upon this "dangerous knowledge" and used it to their own advantage, regardless of its cost to humankind. High-mindedness, magnanimity, compassion, the moral law, the Christian faith—none of these deterred them for an instant. Nor will they deter other equally "good" men, to say nothing of evil men, in years to come. It is an inane fallacy that this atomic bomb will do away with war. What the atomic bomb has done is simply to complete war's horror, to perfect its work of death.

II

The peace which followed the dropping of the bomb on Hiroshima does not alter in the slightest degree its initial horror and disaster. This end does not justify this means. The act remains what it is—a colossal crime which we would instantly have recognized as such had Germany and not our own country been guilty of the offense. What was shattered when that bomb exploded was not merely a city, and an empire, but the whole system of moral law.

But putting morals to one side, as our age so easily does, there remains the ultimate, as contrasted with the immediate, consequence of this event. From every truly human standpoint this first chapter of the story is bad enough. But beyond this lies a second chapter, and then a third—and at last a closing chapter. A finis! Not until all the returns are in, years hence, can we say what we have done. In this case the prospect chills the very blood.

Not by such means will humanity, or any nation, be ultimately saved. Not in the realm of sheer brute force lies the remedy we seek. The words of the ancient prophet, Zechariah, "Not by power, nor by might, but by my spirit, saith the Lord," are echoed by our own great scientist, Charles Steinmetz:

"The greatest discovery will be along spiritual lines. Here is a force which history clearly teaches has been the greatest power in the development of man. Yet we have been merely playing with it, and never seriously studied it as we have the social forces. Some day people will learn that material things do not bring happiness and are of little use in making men creative. Then the scientists of the world will turn their laboratories over to the study of God and the spiritual forces which as yet have been hardly scratched."

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway
New York, 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

J. ELLIOTT FINLAY
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., and at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

September 1945 — Vol. XI—No. 9

Vindication and Responsibility

By JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

I

IN THE FIRST ISSUE of FELLOWSHIP after Pearl Harbor, we said:

"The one effective answer to totalitarian aggression is total Christianity. This includes for us total pacifism. This faith gives us radiant light. We have seen it give light to others. Through others, such as the Quakers, this light first came to many among us. We are persuaded that what we see, thousands, and then millions, of men can see. In the near future—if you measure time by centuries instead of years—men will live by the light and power of the pacifist faith and method, just as today whole nations live in the daylight of truth revealed by the scientific method and its pioneers. . . .

We shall not support the war. Our allegiance is to a total Christ who calls us to the ways of a total love that casts out the evil methods of war."

Thereafter, throughout the subsequent forty-three monthly issues of FELLOWSHIP, while most publications in the country were supporting the war, we continued unabated our witness to the pacifist position, we sought to arouse conscience against such particular iniquities as the Allied food blockade, evacuation of Japanese-Americans from their homes, obliteration bombing of cities, and the bitter-end prosecution of the war with no visible attempt to win peace by negotiation. We defended the stand of conscientious objectors and fought proposals for conscription of labor and post-war military conscription. We pointed out the places where Dumbarton Oaks and the United Nations Charter seemed to us gravely defective in "the things that belong unto peace." Now the end of hostilities has come, punctuated by the first use of the atomic bomb, dropped by Americans on the hearts of two cities and searing out of existence all living things within range of its ruin.

II

Vindication of pacifism will still be in dispute for a long time, but we may note, at the end of this greatest period of violence which the world has ever seen, at least two things that point in the direction of vindication.

First. The suppression of pacifist testimony by war-making governments and peoples has not been nearly as great as we thought and said before the war that it would be. Even in Hitler's notorious prison camps of Buchenwald and Belsen, over 300 conscientious objectors are reported to have survived. There were also German pastors and other pacifists, some of whom were never imprisoned. Among these was Wilhelm Mensching, Secretary of the German FOR, who refused to say "Heil Hitler" and continued to remind his congregation right through the war that even in the dark house of Hitler's Reich, "It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness." In occupied Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, France, Denmark, and other countries, the Fellowship of Reconciliation was not crushed out. We do not yet know the full story of the Fellowship in Europe and Asia, but enough has come through to let us see that not only has the Fellowship, defenseless within totalitarian countries, survived, but it is emerging as a more influential force than it was at the war's beginning.

In England and the United States the Fellowship has more members, more money, and more prestige than it had in 1939. What is more remarkable, it has been allowed full liberty of speech and propaganda. In the last war three issues of the American Fellowship's magazine, *The World Tomorrow,* were denied circulation in the United States mail until President Wilson was persuaded to intervene. In this war we have published and circulated a much larger amount of pacifist and anti-conscription literature without a single remonstrance on the part of the Federal authorities. Another outstanding difference of attitude toward pacifism in the two wars is that this time many of the churches recognized pacifism as a legitimate Christian position. Their support of conscientious objectors has been halting and inadequate but it has not been in total eclipse, as happened before. And, this time the churches in giving their consent to the Allied side in the war have not gone all-out for a Christian crusade; instead, they have been "mournful warriors" with many misgivings about the course they were taking.

Second. A more startling vindication has been contributed by science in the atomic bomb. Hosts of non-

pacifists the world over will now be more ready than ever before to take seriously our oft repeated assertion that there cannot be security without international elimination of armaments, military establishments, and the technology of mass destruction. Professor H. D. Smyth, Chairman of the Department of Physics at Princeton University, and one of those who shared in developing the atomic bomb in New Mexico, states that it is "potentially destructive beyond the wildest nightmares of the imagination" and "so ideally suited to sudden unannounced attack that a country's major cities might be destroyed overnight by an ostensibly friendly power." Dr. Donald Leet, Professor of Geophysics at Harvard, who witnessed the test explosion in New Mexico at a distance of 50 miles said:

"When it let go, it lit up 180 degrees of the horizon, not like one, but a dozen brilliant suns. It stayed lit up and made chills run up my back because I knew what might happen if it was not controlled. It was followed by a brilliant wall of flame. Fifty miles away it was like an earthquake. At the source the brilliance was so great that an individual looking at it would have been blinded. One observer did so and was blinded. It created a crater half a mile across and a quarter of a mile long."

Now a later type bomb which we dropped on Nagasaki was, according to military observers, so much more efficient that it has rendered the first type obsolete. The moral implications of any use of such a weapon were immediately sensed even by men who had not spoken out against previous ways of bombing. Among them two chief leaders of the Federal Council of Churches, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam and John Foster Dulles, announced: "If we, a professedly Christian nation, feel morally free to use atomic energy in that way, men elsewhere will accept that verdict. Atomic weapons will be looked upon as a normal part of the arsenal of war and the stage will be set for the sudden and final destruction of mankind."

There are still advocates of preparedness who will argue that the way for a nation to be secure is to be more advanced in the science of death-dealing technology than its possible enemies and to strike first; but will the majority of churches, labor organizations, and educators support this view? Either that or they will move toward the pacifist prescription of disarmament, peaceful change, and the creation of mutual trust on which everything else must rest.

III

At the end of this war, however, I feel that *responsibility* should be a greater key word for pacifists than vindication. Our battle for permanent peace is far from won. In the next five, ten, or fifteen years nations will make the crucial decisions that will spell a third world war or the relegation of war to the past. In these circumstances a fearful responsibility rests upon us who believe in the pacifist way. We dare not be complacent, or self-righteous, or slacken our effort in the slightest. The responsibility of our position just now is particularly this:

First. There is a famine for bread in vast areas of the earth, but an even greater famine for truth. We must do all we can to lessen both. Although governmental and private relief agencies will try to alleviate the famine for food, there is less chance that they will supply nutriment for mental and spiritual hunger. Their propaganda and educational projects are largely darkened by nationalism. Consequently, it should be a priority on the resources of religious pacifism to supply all the light of universal truth that it can bring into the situation. To the multitudes now sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death we are called to give the light that can help them to go on living. We must help them to interpret their suffering, our own hard-heartedness, and the world's tragedy by a broader perspective of truth; such, for instance, as the indestructible oneness of the human family, love as the law of life, and love in the Crucifixion and Resurrection as the pledge that God's compassion for saint and sinner (and nation) is still the one way of salvation for all.

It should hardly be necessary to add that if pacifists quarrel among themselves, if they darken the light that is in them by continual recrimination, bitterness, and division, if they fail to co-operate fully among themselves and with others in the post-war construction of peace, they will miserably fail in their mission. Conscription has to be fought not only in the United States and England, but also in Latin America where it has been catching on, and in Russia and elsewhere. The fear aroused by the atomic bomb, the robot plane, and impending inventions of science must not be crystalized in military time tables of defense, but it must be used to motivate disarmament and measures to make the peace not only tolerable but attractive for all peoples. Now is the time to press mightily for disarmament and the abolition of conscription by universal agreement. To project the light of pacifying truth onto the dark battleground of clashing ideas, of racial and national prejudice, and to give men hope, courage and indomitable faith—this is more *our* task than to supply them with physical bread. And this time we cannot do the job with candles. It requires the power of collectively organized light.

Second. The end of the war demands of us sacrificial consecration. Recently I received a letter from Laurence Housman in which he said, "The 'Victory' in the European half of the war has not left me very hopeful. We are not sharing our sufficiency of food with the half-starved nations of Europe as we ought to be doing. Fifty-fifty it should be, to my mind, if we are to have a clean conscience about it. . . ." I remember also the saying of Zacchaeus, the taxgatherer, to Jesus, "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods, I give to the poor." Can the pacifists of America have clean consciences unless we put this question of "fifty-fifty" up to ourselves?

Certainly the penetrating power of our witness to truth will be directly related to what we are willing to suffer for truth. We cannot rest on our past sufferings, but we must continually be baptized afresh into the vast community of suffering that overspreads so much of the earth today.

America has suffered relatively less than other nations, she has a better chance for recovery and they know that it is her bombs, lend-lease, and mechanized might that have wiped out more cities and spread devastation over a vaster area than ever happened in history before. That situation is not conducive to peace. Yet there are well-springs of mercy, sympathy, and vast generosity in the American people. Can they be opened in a measure commensurate with the demands of the next ten years of peace? Can American pacifists set the right example? Can we make atonement by all-out consecration of ourselves, souls and bodies, to the reconciliation for which we long?

The Peril and Promise of Potsdam

By SAMUEL D. MARBLE*

ACCORDING TO THE POTSDAM STATEMENT of our intentions for Germany, we mean to have both revenge and social revolution, we want the Germans to be both impoverished and peace-loving, we intend to control and transform their economy and at the same time create an illusion of democracy. We plan to deprive millions of people of their homes and their jobs, yet make them responsible for carrying out these decisions. Reiterating the promises and threats of the past, the Potsdam conference declaration contains all the inconsistencies and incompatibilities that have marked previous proclamations of the victor nations.

The joint declaration says that our intentions regarding Germany are: (1) to make her a democratic and peace-loving nation. (2) to control completely her economy, so as to transform it into one of agriculture and peaceful domestic industry, making military production impossible. (3) to extract reparations that will result in eliminating half or more of the country's capital industry. (4) to cause the Germans to feel responsibility for building the peace and carrying out the terms of the Potsdam program. (5) to make Germany "atone" for its terrible crime, and realize that it is utterly vanquished and at the will of the victors. This is an interesting group of objectives, but any fairly alert infant can see that all the groceries will not fit into one basket.

Because these intentions for Germany can scarcely be harmonized, rather than spend more time analyzing the aims of the victors, let us consider the actual methods to be employed, their probable consequences, and our responsibilities in working for the creative evolution of the situation.

Council of Ministers

Potsdam injects confusion into the picture of world organization by creating a new international agency, a Council of Ministers, composed of representatives of the five great nations, replete with a continuing secretariat of its own. The life of the new organization is not specified. Its immediate function is to draw up treaties of peace for the strap-hanger nations that rode along on the Axis express. These include Hungary, Bulgaria, Finland, and Italy. Further, the new council is to "meet from time to time" as occasion requires. Presumably the duration of the new diplomatic creature will be for not less than the period required to administer the Potsdam prescription, which in the case of reparations may continue for a maximum period of five years. If the clauses requiring democratic re-education of Germany are taken seriously the Big Five will have a job that may last for decades.

The new agency comes into existence because we are determined to avoid one of the mistakes of the last peace, that of shackling the League of Nations with the corpse of Versailles. This time we established a different kind of organization, one less democratic, in which both power and responsibility are concentrated in a few hands. The validity of this decision to separate the function of peace-making and peace-keeping will be tested by events that lie ahead.

Confusion comes because of the uncertainty of the relationship between the United Nations Organization and the new Council of Ministers. UNO is not responsible for making peace treaties. Ostensibly it is not charged with carrying out their provisons. It is concerned with conflicts that may arise as a consequence of the peace terms dictated by the Council of Ministers.

It is difficult to see how UNO can deal with unrest that is bound to arise without facing up to the source of infection. The United States may soon find itself a member of two international agencies, one building up tensions that lead to war, the other devoted to preserving peace.

The Chaos of Europe

Potsdam frankly makes no attempt to solve the basic problem of Europe. The declaration recognizes that certain *de-facto* shifts of power have taken place, but it does not alter the underlying system of power politics in Europe. The continent is to be reshaped on essentially the same pattern as that of the last decade. The only noteworthy changes will be found in the destinies of the middle European states which, in astrological terms, now come under the influence of the red star rather than the crooked cross.

The re-establishment of Germany as a separate nation is presaged by the paragraphs of the declarations stipulating that certain administrative departments will be set up to work out unified policies for all areas under occupation. These agencies will become the administrative core of the new and chastened German nation.

This leaves Western Europe the same dreary, disunited continent. All of the ancient schisms that have spawned hatred, greed, and aggression in the past will continue to work until Europe finds a focus of common interest that works toward a lessening of the sovereignty of the nation-state. The Big Three, who at San Francisco blatantly stated their determination not to sacrifice one whit of their national independence, were scarcely in a position to lead mangled Europe to unification on any other basis.

Germany's Punishment

Potsdam takes from Germany the province of East Prussia, most of Pomerania and Silesia, and a sizeable portion of Brandenburg. It creates that many more Alsace-Lorraines. It spells the loss of approximately one-sixth of Germany's total pre-war territory. Within these areas is the choicest agricultural land, and the separation of these sections means a lowering of the standard of living far out of proportion to the actual territory involved.

The residents of these areas are to be wrenched away and permanently settled in what remains of the truncated German state. A civilian population in excess of 11 million

* Engaged in the educational program of the American Friends Service Committee, the author developed relief and rehabilitation courses used in Civilian Public Service.

will thus be deprived not only of their homes and property, but of their livelihood as well, and will be dumped to fare for themselves in the most horribly ruined portions of the vanquished land.

Under the reparations clauses the Soviets will be permitted to take half of what remains of the usable industrial equipment of Germany. The machines are to be taken away and the people who ran them will be left without their customary employment. The fact that the Big Three emphatically declared that Germany must never be permitted to rebuild her industrial potential means that for these workers an early return to their jobs is more than a little unlikely.

In addition to the 50 per cent of the capital industry that goes into the Russian bag, the French, British, and Americans are free to take as much as they want of what is left in the areas under their jurisdiction. The German fleet is also forfeit, and so are any monetary reserves that may be turned up. With them disappear the prospects of foreign trade and the importation of food and supplies, in exchange for either currency or kind.

Trouble Ahead

The dispossessed at this tabulation include the 11 million repatriates, perhaps 14 million industrial workers, and those whose sustenance depended on export-import trade. Add to these approximately 2½ millions in service industries whose jobs disappeared when cities were demolished. These include the printers, janitors, teachers, cinema operators, plumbers, and shop-keepers who no longer have a place to ply their trades. Add the roughly 8 million discharged veterans, and the Germans who have lived outside the country and are now to be returned to their homeland. What will these people do? Where will they live? What will they eat?

All of this can only hint the proportion of frustration and resentment that is to be the inheritance of the German people. It cannot tell of the freight of anguish carried in the Potsdam terms, for these are statistics and, as Arthur Koestler says, "Statistics do not bleed." What is to become of the countless people who are rooted up like weeds and cast upon the rubbish of a broken country? Most of them will start by sweeping up ruined cities. Though that is indispensable as a beginning, it does not produce wheat or underwear or babies' bottles or cello strings. That merely clears the way for the incomprehensible task of restoring a country to the point where life can begin again.

What this new life is to be when the beginning is made, we do not know. All we are told is what it shall not be. Germany is not again to develop industry, chemicals, machinery, or metals that are relevant to war production. We intend "to control all German public or private scientific bodies, research and experimental institutions, laboratories, etc., connected with economic activities." Note that the last phrase is "connected with economic activities," not "military activities." That connotes sweeping intellectual supervision completely incompatible with democratic tradition.

Our Potsdam policy threatens to build up psychic pressures of dissatisfaction, frustration, and resentment. Because we realize the threat of these pent-up forces we have resolved to dam every channel by which these dynamisms might break forth in belligerent expression.

Once before we built the barricades of frustration. We forbade the construction of warships of more than 10,000 tons, but the Germans built a pocket battleship that made history. The entire economic order was pitched against them, and the Germans devised a system of trade and exchange that shook international commerce. We banished their army, so they planned new forces that revolutionized warfare. We built the dikes but they did not hold.

This time we've built a higher, thicker barricade than ever before. But the whole repressive system is in itself a challenge to the human forces that are blocked behind it. Somewhere, through the wall, under it or over it, these energies will find an outlet. If they are ingenious enough they will spill into new channels, with unimaginable effects.

Possibilities in Peace

What has happened to Germany is catastrophic, but we must not let ourselves be paralyzed by our fears of what we have done. There is still one huge outlet for the energy and intelligence of these defeated people. That channel is hard to see because it is camouflaged with cynicism and despair. Yet it is there and it possesses a potential that could transform the world.

The opportunity is for Germany to become the great peace-loving, peace-building nation of the planet. How startled and defenseless we would be if Germany actually undertook to become a peace-loving nation! Not "peace-loving" in the tarnished American sense, which implies an average of one war a generation and a record of spending more on the military than on all the other functions of state together—but genuinely, honestly, a transforming pacific force.

If the German people would turn their great inventive intelligence to devising the mechanisms of peaceful change, to finding methods for men to live together in unity and understanding, they would stir irresistible responses in the hearts of all men. If German energy were to detour the dikes constructed at Potsdam, and surge into this new channel, this despised nation can become the most respected on earth.

One recalls the biting irony of Comstock Glaser's letter about *How Germany Won the Third World War* by being the only nation to remain pacifist in the next global conflict. Germany has nothing left to lose. She can afford to risk the extreme and unorthodox changes this would involve. Inherent in German thought is the mystic quality necessary to dream and carry through such a profound reformation. Surely vestiges remain of the great surge of pacifist expression that shook Germany after the last war. Certainly the impulse that roused it is more urgent than ever.

Recourse to violence undid everything, both good and bad, in the German program. What if Germany were to recognize that, and act accordingly? Strategically placed at the very crux of all the forces of nationalism and militarism, she could change the world as she could not by violence.

Perhaps one hopeful aspect of the Potsdam program is its very impossibility. The program is bound to break of its own weight. If Germany's outlet from the impossible terms set up at Potsdam doesn't lead into the direction of peace, then it will flood into another direction, with which we are already tragically familiar.

Report on Puerto Rico

By ALLAN KNIGHT CHALMERS and JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

THE UNITED STATES IS ON THE SPOT as to what it will do about Puerto Rico—test case, for us, of the world's present colonial problem. Because of this the Fellowship of Reconciliation commissioned the authors of this report to go to Puerto Rico and find out by personal investigation what the people of Puerto Rico desire for their future status. In a month's visit we obviously could not attempt anything as ambitious as a poll of the Island opinion, and we would be the first to disclaim too great authority for our findings; nevertheless, for two reasons we had unusual opportunities to get a real look at things: (1) Our mission was in no sense tied to any special interest of government, political party, or economic or religious coterie with power to dispense or withhold any sort of favors, and (2) We had the assistance of a disinterested and able group of about 100 workers in Civilian Public Service units throughout the Island—young people who have lived there for from one to three years, engaged in medical and social relief outside of the cities and doing manual labor for Puerto Rican peasants in and around their homes. Through them, we were enabled to listen in on "bull sessions" and intimate conversations of Puerto Rican groups, hear them argue with each other, ask them whatever questions we wanted, and later check and compare the answers from different parts of the Island.

However, we did not tie ourselves to the CPS group. We had our own letters of introduction to government officials, representatives of political parties, and other personages—from Governor Tugwell on down. Some of them we saw in their own homes as, for example, Luis Muñoz Marín, President of the Puerto Rican Senate and Leader of the Popular Party; Martin Travieso, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; Dr. Rafael Cordero, the Auditor of Puerto Rico; and, Dr. José Gallardo, former Commissioner of Education. On one occasion three leaders of the Congress for Independence gave us lunch in San Juan's Palace Hotel; we were luncheon guests at the Bankers' Club of a prominent Puerto Rican of decidedly different views.

We visited a coffee farm, three sugar centrals, a needlework shop, the Ponce Cement Co., the Institute of Tropical Agriculture and the U.S. Agricultural Experiment Station in Mayaguez; and various hospitals, churches, and educational institutions. We talked with leading representatives of the Puerto Rican associations for statehood and independence, with the Chief Attorney of the Free Federation of Workers, with the Director of the regional office of the National Labor Relations Board, with the leading Puerto Rican attorney of the prosecution in the Supreme Court cases limiting the ownership and control of land to 500 acres for any corporation. We participated in an all-day conference of members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. We traveled the Island from end to end and up into its central mountainous region. For 25 days we concentrated on seeing and listening to Puerto Rico.

Colonial Status Unsatisfactory

(1) The first observation to be made in our findings is that *we discovered no one who approved of the present status of Puerto Rico as a colony of the United States.* As Geigel-Polanco, floor leader of the Popular Democratic Party in the Senate has stated, "Among all political parties and civic and economic sectors of Puerto Rico, the unanimous opinion prevails that the colonial system of government should be totally and definitely abolished." The North-American vice president and general manager of a very large sugar company told us that Puerto Rico should be allowed to elect her own Governor and that her people were capable of self-government. Governor Tugwell in his message of last February to the Legislature, after referring to the Atlantic Charter, said, "It is time, past time, for Puerto Ricans to choose the form of government under which they desire to live."

Clearly it is a matter of great injustice that Puerto Ricans are not allowed to participate in the determination of national decisions on matters of such vital concern as tariffs, coastwise shipping, labor legislation, and agricultural and educational policies. Nor has the United States followed any considered and consistent policy in its regulations for the Island. One Puerto Rican, intimately acquainted with Washington, recently said: "There are perhaps a dozen members of Congress who favor our independence, maybe a dozen who are against it, and about 500 members who know nothing about us at all." In these circumstances the Island tends to become a football of the bargainings, whims, or prejudices of politicians and bureaucrats who are absentees from Puerto Rico.

Furthermore, it is impossible to make adequate plans for the future development of Puerto Rico or to secure long-term business commitments when nobody knows what the political status of the Island is going to be even five years from now. For all these reasons we cannot emphasize too strongly our conclusion that the present colonial status of Puerto Rico is highly unsatisfactory, undemocratic, and unfair; and that the United States ought to take prompt steps in collaboration with Puerto Rico to think out and establish a new and more equable relationship between the two peoples.

Plebiscite A Step Toward Solution

(2) *The next step toward a solution appears to us to be the holding of a plebiscite in which the inhabitants of Puerto Rico could vote their free choice as between alternatives of status which the Congress of the United States would agree to recognize as binding after a choice had been made.* This choice for Puerto Rico should offer (a) complete independence, (b) opportunity to become a state in the Union when reasonable requirements for statehood are met, or (c) thoroughgoing home rule within the frame of voluntary federation with the United States either bilaterally or, if other Caribbean countries are included, multilaterally. The economic and other conditions accompanying each alternative should be stated specifically, and they ought to be generous to Puerto Rico in view of the abundant wealth of the United States and the limited resources of Puerto Rico.

We are opposed to certain provisions of the Tydings-

Piñero Plebiscite Bill (S 1002 and HR 3237), but believe it should be sympathetically and carefully considered by Congress. This bill was presented to Congress by an official commission of the Puerto Rican legislature, composed of members of all parties, and it springs from the mandate to seek a plebiscite overwhelmingly voted in the Puerto Rican elections of last October. Amendments and negotiation are doubtless in order, but the general principle of a plebiscite seems to us sound. The Conference of Fellowship of Reconciliation members in Puerto Rico, held at San Juan, July 28, 1945, stated:

"We endorse the basic principle of a plebiscite, which, as contained in the Tydings-Piñero Bill, provides for a choice among the alternatives of Independence, Statehood and Dominion."

Although certain leaders of the Independence group, in conversation with us, opposed a plebiscite, we do not think that majority opinion in the Island endorses their view. On the contrary, almost all of our evidence is to the effect that the general opinion has not changed since last October's elections. We share the convictions of the FOR Conference mentioned above that "The people of Puerto Rico are competent to choose their own political future" and that "prevailing conditions in Puerto Rico are favorable to the holding of a fair plebiscite at the earliest possible moment." The Conference believed that "a period of six months to one year should be allowed the people of Puerto Rico for the full expression and consideration of all points of view." Governor Tugwell stated in February that "the coming four years ought to be a favorable time for working out a solution."

Overpopulation Is Increasing

(3) *Underlying and conditioning any political choice that Puerto Ricans may make is a grave problem of population and economics.* The "Development Plan for Puerto Rico," prepared by Frederic P. Barlett and others for the Puerto Rico Planning, Urbanizing, and Zoning Board and presented to Governor Tugwell in January, 1944, calls it "the 'problem' of Puerto Rico" and says:

> "The problem arises from an increasing growth in population with no land frontier to push forward and an insufficiently rapid increase in productivity. Puerto Rico is an island 1,000 miles removed from the continental country of which it forms both an economic and political part. It possesses few mineral resources of commercial importance, and its available land for cultivation is limited to 1,000,000 acres. Yet its population has twice doubled in the last 100 years and at present shows no tendency whatsoever to taper off. . . . Estimates indicate that the population will continue to increase at its present rate until at least 1960, when it will reach almost 2,900,000. Within only 20 years Puerto Rico will have another 1,000,000 people to feed—and it cannot adequately feed its present 1,900,000. By 1960 there will be in Puerto Rico three persons for every acre of arable land. These facts mean that the pressure of population on resources, which is already great, will become intolerably greater."

It is not within the scope of our report to survey Puerto Rico's economic and social difficulties, but the above quotation should indicate that they are extremely serious and that national political choices, with their economic and social concomitants, are a matter of life or death for hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans. Set in the midst of a ruthlessly competitive world and unable to support its population by any self-contained economy, this little island has no economic margin or cushion on which it can fall back if it takes a wrong turn in the road. Certainly it cannot afford to determine its course by political generalizations from the eighteenth century or by emotional slogans which leave out of account the economic realties of Puerto Rico's meager physical resources. More certainly, pressure and ideological groups who live in the United States, and who will not have to bear the death and desolation of a wrong decision for the human beings who live in Puerto Rico, should proceed with great circumspection in dealing with these delicate problems.

Island Opinion Divided

(4) *On the vexing question of what status the Puerto Ricans themselves desire, we found a division of opinion.* There are those who sincerely and passionately want Independence. They ask for divorce with alimony from the United States, and some of them would choose divorce even if they could not get the alimony. Professor Rafael Soltero-Peralta, representative of the Congress for Independence at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, his brother Professor Juan Enrique Soltero-Peralta of the University of Puerto Rico, and Senator Vincente Geigel-Polanco were among those who laid the case for Independence before us. They argued for it on both spiritual and economic grounds and as a natural right which every people ought to possess.

But we talked with other Puerto Ricans who rejected the Independence position and sincerely and passionately wanted Puerto Rico to be tied to the United States like any other state in our Union. For instance, Professor Reece Bothwell, prominent in the Puerto Rico Statehood Association, pointed out that Statehood was what Puerto Ricans had hoped for when the United States took over the Island from Spain. Puerto Rico, unlike the Philippines, did not fight a war for independence against us. The total number of lives lost when the United States took possession of Puerto Rico was 5 U.S. soldiers killed and 17 Puerto Ricans.

Advocates of Statehood argued, further, that when the Jones Bill in 1917 conferred United States citizenship on Puerto Ricans it was logical to expect that in due time full Statehood would follow. It was like baptism which raises the expectancy that in the natural course of things a person baptised in the Church will later be admitted to full communion. A prominent Puerto Rican told us that when he accepted United States citizenship, he expected it to be a partnership that would last for life, like marriage. We heard of Puerto Ricans who said they would emigrate to the United States if the Island went independent.

In between the advocates of Independence and the advocates of Statehood are the Puerto Ricans who today would vote for Dominion status. They tend to be swayed less by sentiment and more by economic and practical considerations than the other two groups. To them it seems inevitable that if the $100,000,000 market in the United States for Puerto Rican sugar were to be curtailed by tariff provisions such as those proposed in Senator Tydings' former bill (S 227—this is not the plebiscite bill) or by putting Puerto Rico on a parity with Cuba on the United States tariff list, economic and social disaster would follow swiftly for Puerto Rico. Political independence in that case, they argue, would go into the discard, because, before long the Puerto Rican President, or a dictator who might take over, would have to borrow large sums from foreign capitalists

to pay not only for public works to reduce unemployment but also for the police and soldiers through whom he would seek to maintain his rule. Such things already have happened in nearby Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and this black forecast did not seem impossible to some leading Puerto Ricans with whom we talked.

Whether with Statehood, or Independence, Puerto Ricans would have to shoulder heavy economic burdens. For instance, under Statehood they would be subject to the United States federal income tax from which they are now exempt; and the Island would lose the very considerable excise and customs taxes on rum and other products which the United States now returns to the Insular Government.

But weightier than the economic arguments against Statehood was the belief we encountered that the United States simply would not contemplate giving Statehood to Puerto Rico in any circumstances. Although two United States Senators made the journey to Ponce for a great Statehood rally on the Sunday just previous to our departure, Senator Tydings had insisted in the Hearings before his Committee last March that Statehood is as dead a notion as Hector's ghost. Well, if that be true, why bother about it? The sensible thing, we were told, is for Puerto Rico to take the best thing she may be able to get today, *i.e.,* Dominion status.

If Congress agrees to the liberal economic provisions of the Tydings-Piñero Bill they would be about the same whether Puerto Rico chooses Independence or Dominion status. However, supporters of Dominion status doubt very much that Congress would agree to as liberal economic provisions for Puerto Rico divorced from the United States as for Puerto Rico in the Union. They point out, for instance, that such provisions would conflict with our present multilateral trade agreements program. Cuba would ask why we give special favors to Puerto Rico when it has chosen Independence the same as Cuba did? The Philippines could ask the same question. Other nations also would ask it, although in a different form. The beet sugar interests in the United States would hardly be silent. Governor Tugwell, who favors a plebiscite and free choice for the Puerto Ricans, nevertheless said pointedly in his message to the Puerto Rican legislature:

> "I cannot conceive that funds will be given or benefits granted without supervision over their expenditure and administration. Even the States of the Union do not expect to be free of Federal control to the extent to which aid is given. There is by now a system of aid for various public health measures and assistance to the needy, for education, for road building, for low-cost housing, for benefits to farmers, for conservation practices, for low-interest agricultural loans—these and many more aids are deeply embedded not only in the economy and Government of Puerto Rico but in the needs and affections of Puerto Ricans. . . . I do not believe they could be kept with complete separation."

Luis Muñoz-Marín told us that he is writing a primer outlining the economic consequences to Puerto Rico of the choices for Independence, Statehood, or Dominion. He hopes to use it as an educational instrument in the discussions preceding a plebiscite. We believe it will be of interest to Fellowship members when it is published.

No Independence from U.S. Military

(5) We take up next the *provisions in the Tydings-Piñero Bill which deal with war and military matters.* Whether the Puerto Ricans choose Independence, Dominion status, or Statehood, this bill ties them hand and foot to the military program of the United States and to all future wars in which the United States may engage.

For example, under "Independence" Puerto Rico would be required to embody in its national constitution and in a treaty with the United States the pledge that "in any war in which the United States is involved the Republic of Puerto Rico shall be an ally of the United States and shall give all co-operation to the war effort within and without the territorial limits of Puerto Rico." In time of peace it must grant to the United States, the right, "after consultation with the Government of Puerto Rico, to establish and maintain such naval and military bases with all necessary installations as the Government of the United States may consider convenient for the purpose of defense of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Western Hemisphere." Full movement of U.S. armed forces to and from all ports and airports and free transit of troops and operation of U.S. Intelligence Services are guaranteed. Under Dominion status the complete war legislation of the U.S., including conscription, would "be applicable to Puerto Rico to the same extent as to the United States."

Under the above provisions Puerto Rico would have no independence of choice as to what wars she will fight or refrain from, to what extent she will be made the Gibraltar of the Caribbean or the buffer state of U.S. imperialism, nor would her Dominion status, like that of Canada, give her freedom to refuse domestic or overseas conscription or to refuse to fight at all in the mother country's wars. The Fellowship of Reconciliation Conference in San Juan, in recording its opposition to the military sections of the Tydings-Piñero Bill, stated: "This opposition grows not only out of our pacifist convictions, but also out of our concern for the political integrity of Puerto Rico as either a dominion or an independent state." We would point out further the important fact that the United States is actually proceeding full speed ahead with enlarged military and naval installations in Puerto Rico and that this is part of a larger plan to extend U.S. naval and air bases throughout the Western Hemisphere and the Pacific.

Economic Exploitation Reduced

(6) *In the matter of economic exploitation we think that the picture is not so one-sided as is that of our military relationship.* Speaking broadly, the Government of the United States has not aligned its power with private economic interests to anything like the same extent that it is lined up with military interests.

In support of this statement we cite, in particular, the case of the sugar companies. As is well known, after Puerto Rico was drawn into the United States' economic orbit in 1898, the natural result of the profit motive and colonial system would have been to turn the Island into an economic fief of absentee American sugar barons. That this did occur to a considerable extent is undeniable. We could not but sympathize with the remark which a distinguished Puerto Rican lawyer made to us that, "Nothing is so bitter in my mouth as the taste of your sugar." On the other hand, an unprejudiced observer would have to report that the notable fight which Puerto Ricans have waged to prevent the permanent control of the Island by a monopoly, or near monopoly, of sugar interests has been enormously aided by the United States Law of May 1, 1900, restricting

the ownership and control of land by any corporation engaged in agriculture to *not more than five hundred acres.* For three and a half decades this law was a dead letter, but in 1935 the people of Puerto Rico went to the courts to get it enforced and after five years of battle in the courts of Puerto Rico, and finally in the Supreme Court of the United States, completely won their case. They have also enacted legislation putting the sugar companies into the category of public utilities with regulation of wages and hours. And the sugar companies are conforming.

It is also a fact that in returning to Puerto Rico all the customs and excise duties on rum, tobacco, and other products; in exempting Puerto Ricans from Federal income taxes and granting them United States citizenship with unrestricted immigration to the United States; in continuing to give them the opportunity of free trade in the American market; and in appropriating millions of dollars for education and all sorts of social reconstruction projects, Congress has given substantial benefits to the Island. While there have been economic drawbacks which we would not minimize, it is a fair question whether the United States has not put more into the Island than American-owned corporations have taken out.

Civil Liberties Protected

(7) *We believe that civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, and of the right to agitate and to strike, are today reasonably protected.* We believe they are maintained as well as, and perhaps better than, in the United States. Last winter a strike of workers in the sugar centrals stopped production for several weeks, but there was no violence nor did the authorities attempt to compel men to return to work. James Watson, Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board; Hipolito Marcano, attorney for the Free Federation of Workers; and others stated in conversations with us that today the civil liberties situation is good, that the Insular police are well behaved on the whole, and that there is no popular hostility to them.

(8) In our *inquiries about Pedro Albizu Campos* and his movement of a decade ago for Independence we were assured by ten different Puerto Ricans who had heard him speak, or had talked privately with him, that he was not then a pacifist nor comparable to Gandhi. The very question seemed absurd to these men and evoked such replies as "not by a long shot," or "he was a terrorist." They said he talked in terms of violence and assassination, surrounded himself with an armed body guard, and recruited and drilled young fellows for revolution against the United States. Three or four of those with whom we talked had formerly belonged to Albizu's coterie and had urged him to abandon tactics of violence; one of them had told him about the program of Gandhi, but Albizu Campos would have none of it, saying that non-violence would not work in Puerto Rico even if it did in India. We were told that the Government did not take Albizu's talk of revolution and his drilling of recruits seriously, however, until overt violence began to occur; then the discovery of an automobile loaded with dynamite being driven by his followers to a student meeting at the University, the assassination of Colonel Riggs, the attempt on the life of Judge Cooper, and other incidents changed the picture. If the responsibility of Albizu Campos for these happenings has not been proved, yet he did not speak out against them, and the opinion seems to be general that the Independence movement was definitely set back by the violent tone of Albizu's leadership. However that may be, we believe that today a Presidential pardon for him and those of his associates who are still held in detention is long overdue.

CPS Highly Successful

(9) *The Civilian Public Service Units are doing a magnificent job and winning praise from Puerto Ricans of all classes.* All of the work projects are under the authority of the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration and U.S. Selective Service has not found it necessary to intervene for disciplinary or other reasons.

The work carried on is obviously directed to meet clear human needs and the *morale* of the great majority of the CO's appeared to be excellent. Four of the boys have married Puerto Ricans, and several are planning to continue voluntary work on the Island after CPS is demobilized. The Mennonite Service Committee has decided to continue its hospital at La Plata; the Brethren Service Committee will continue the Castañer Project for three years more and the Presbyterian Church expects to initiate a Unit in the western part of the Island next fall.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, in speaking to us of the work at Castañer, where he had personally visited, expressed the opinion that this was the most effective way to get medical service to the majority of Puerto Rico's people. They live in the country, and to build and operate rural dispensaries and simple hospitals seemed to him a much better investment of funds than if the money were put in elaborate hospitals in one or two cities.

That the need for rural medical service is desperate may be gathered from statements such as those made to us by the doctor who directed the Mennonite hospital at La Plata. For instance, 14 out of 15 children coming to the hospital are infested with intestinal parasites. There are 70,000 persons living within reach of this hospital and only two Puerto Rican doctors resident in the area, each of them limiting his office hours to an average of hardly more than one hour a day.

CPS men are engaged also in social service, building new type latrines and doing special assignments for PRRA. They are making an impact on the hearts of the Puerto Ricans. We saw fulfilled in CPS in Puerto Rico something of the vision that the founders of CPS had at its beginning when they expected that the religious agencies would have full charge of the CO camps and their discipline and that the work projects assigned would be appropriate to the spiritual capacities of the campers and that the stumbling block of military interference would not be in the picture.

Our Obligation to Puerto Rico

(10) Finally, we wish to emphasize that however the question of Puerto Rico's status may be settled, *there will remain a continuing obligation on the Government of the United States and upon voluntary private associations, such as the Fellowship, to act toward Puerto Rico in a special way of friendship.* We must be something more than a Good Neighbor to this little Island even if she gets Independence. We made all the moves which placed her in our keeping, and retained her as a colony for 47 years on terms

of association which we decided unilaterally. We have no right to change our mind today and cast her out of our political and economic household unilaterally.

Nor should we present Puerto Rico with choices whose alternatives are so onerous both ways that it is a case of choosing between the devil and the deep blue sea. Instead, we must be generous as a wise father is generous to an adopted son.

We believe that Puerto Rico, if she should choose Statehood, would have a valuable contribution to make to the United States culture especially along the line of interracial tolerance, co-operation, and fellowship. If on the other hand, Puerto Rico chooses Independence it will still be our duty to seek to strengthen and multiply all sorts of co-operation between individuals for the mutual benefit of our peoples. Set in the Caribbean on the air and shipping routes to South America, Puerto Rico can hardly keep from becoming a symbol to Latin America and the rest of the world of the international intentions of Uncle Sam. As we do unto Puerto Rico, so shall we be judged.

Labor Day Observations

By A. J. MUSTE

WE OFTEN HAVE HEARD in recent months the suggestion that after the war the power of organized labor ought to be curbed. The argument runs: "Once labor was the under-dog, and it is a good thing that workers organized so as to restore the balance. But now labor has become top-dog and it is necessary to restore the balance in the other direction."

We suggest—now that the war has come to its tragic close to the diabolical noise of the atomic bomb—that such talk is misguided and dangerous. Labor Day is a good time to remind ourselves that organized labor has a very important part to play in maintaining democratic processes in an advanced industrial society. It can hardly be too strong if it is to discharge the responsibility now resting upon it. If we want to salvage something from the war we must not begin by resorting to a favorite Fascist method, which is to destroy the organizations of the workers and, this having been done, to go on and destroy all other free associations.

In an age when the typical employer is not an individual, but an association, corporation, or trust, workers must be able to act in a corporate or co-operative fashion if there is to be that approximate equality of bargaining power without which there can be no free and genuine contract.

When nothing stands between the individual and the absolutist state dominated by a monolithic party, the individual has no freedom in his social relationships. Therefore it is vitally important just now that in their economic, political, cultural, and religious life the people be free to organize. And be it noted that once such freedom is denied to any, the freedom of all is jeopardized and will soon be lost. The churches will do well to bear in mind that in dictatorships of the Right or of the Left where there are no free labor organizations, there are presently no free churches either.

Are Workers Now Secure?

Another way of testing out this proposal that "the power of labor be curbed" is to ask whether the aims of organized labor have been achieved and whether the workers are now secure against any lowering of their standard of living, and against unemployment and economic depression; or to ask whether workers and farmers are now getting a disproportionate share of the income of the nation.

To ask such questions today lays one open to the suspicion of being sarcastic. It has indeed been demonstrated that the United States can wage a global war and at the same time provide its people with a higher standard of living than ever before. We can not again pretend that it is necessary somehow, a matter of "economic law," that people should starve. But we have not taken any adequate measures to see to it that they will not. The concentration of wealth has continued apace during the war. Let a few weeks or months of large-scale unemployment come and "the bottom can fall out of things" again.

These words are being written on the day after the nation celebrated the close of the war against Japan. What are the papers writing about? A friend sends a clipping from Los Angeles reporting that factory employment in California has dropped from a peak of 967,800 to 636,700 in June of this year, and factory pay rolls have fallen from a peak of fifty million dollars per week to thirty-six million. And the demobilization of the eleven million men in the armed forces has hardly begun.

From Washington the War Manpower Commission announces that unemployment may reach 6,500,000 by the end of the year. Cuts such as the following enter into this calculation: in metal-chemical-rubber industries from nearly 8 million employed to 4 million; in ordnance manufacture from a million to a scant hundred thousand; in aircraft from a million to two hundred thousand, and so on.

There seems to have been little planning to avert a serious drop in mass purchasing power during the transition to peacetime production and later in so-called normal times or, on the other hand, to avert inflation. To cite a few instances, President Truman himself strongly recommended federal supplements for inadequate state unemployment-benefit systems, and urged a minimum of $25 for 26 weeks. Congress has not acted. A "full employment" measure of a very moderate character, providing mainly for advance estimates of production and leaning heavily on private enterprise, has been introduced by such senators as Wagner and Murray and has the support of the Treasury Department, but Congress has not acted. No action has been taken

on the War Labor Board plan to boost basic wage rates from 40 to 65 cents an hour. It is almost universally recognized that a big shelf of public works should be accumulated to take up slack in private employment, but the proposed appropriation of $75 million to stimulate state and local authorities to make such plans was cut by Congress to less than $18 million. Congress has not acted on the bill for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee.

Labor and the Veterans

In the face of such conditions no one can say that this is the time to curb the power of organized labor; proposals which would have that effect, such as the recent "B_2H_1" labor bill, should be regarded with suspicion. One exceedingly grave social danger looms if we have large-scale unemployment for any considerable period together with an anti-labor spirit. The danger is that labor and the ex-servicemen will become antagonistic forces with a lot of GIs moving into the camps of agitators like Gerald L. K. Smith.

In this connection widespread publicity ought to be given to an item by a First Class Seaman in the U.S. Navy, reported in the August issue of *Harpers*. He points out that Vice Admiral Taussig in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings last year reported that 35,000 men—or over 1.1 per cent of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—are either absent without leave or absent over leave at all times. This means a loss of 14,000,000 man-days of service each year. On the other hand, the Associated Press reported loss by strikes and lockouts last year of one-tenth of one per cent or 8,500,000 man-days of idleness. That ought to put the quietus for good on the silly and dangerous talk in which even sensible and well-meaning people often engage to the effect that servicemen never "strike" but that silk-shirted workers often strike (of course for no good reason) while servicemen die or, if they live, display a superhuman loyalty to discipline.

Remembering this may help us to keep calm—and to urge our fellow-citizens to do so—during the fierce controversy which may presently rage over jobs and seniority for servicemen. One of the factors in that controversy is General Hershey's Local Board Memo. 190-A interpreting the law about jobs for veterans. (It is interesting to note that here, as in dealing with COs, the General undertakes to be an interpreter as well as administrator of the law.) The General declares that any man who in recent years replaced a drafted man was in a "temporary" job and therefore is not entitled to protection under the act if he in turn were drafted. On the other hand, a man "entitled" to protection must be restored to his job "or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay," even if this means discharging a worker with greater seniority, displacing for example a man who has had a certain job for twenty years!

Employers who suggest that no one hired since May 1, 1940, be allowed any seniority at all, and who offer to lay off any worker in order to make room for veterans may sound very patriotic; but they are playing with dynamite if not with atomic bombs. On the other hand, failure to provide jobs for veterans is also playing with explosives. There is, of course, no genuine remedy except in full employment, and on this Labor Day, 1945, it is far from certain that the United States will provide this.

Organized labor needs to be strong. It is doubtful if it is strong enough. One keen and friendly observer recently said that labor is "terribly vulnerable for the coming post-war survival struggle, riven by dissension and with millions of irresponsible, undisciplined new members." Some recent developments serve "fair notice of what is coming if labor doesn't close ranks (which it probably can't)."

British Labor in Office

It is appropriate and at least moderately encouraging under these circumstances to take brief note of the smashing victory of the British Labor Party in the recent elections. On the day before these words were written King George VI in opening the British Parliament announced that "a measure will be laid before you to bring the Bank of England under public ownership. A bill will also be laid before you to nationalize the coal mining industry."

I sometimes indulge in the risky venture of forecasting trends and events. Several times in recent years I have expressed the conviction that the British Labor Party was engaging in wishful thinking in supposing that it would be possible to unseat Churchill, after he had led Britain triumphantly in war, and to take the peace-making out of his hands. Well, I gladly admit that in part my prophecy failed of fulfillment. Churchill has been unseated and it is a healthy sign.

Now the British Labor Party "will seek to make a revolution by consent" as Harold Laski, its chairman, recently said. "It will try to build a socialist commonwealth for the creation of which it has a decisive mandate by the processes of constitutional democracy." It would be difficult to speak in too sweeping terms about how much depends upon what the British Labor government does in the months ahead. It is clear that the world is moving toward some form of collectivism (or whatever term one may prefer to use). Two considerations are crucial. One is that whatever is built should be built by democratic processes and not by the method of violence. The other one closely related, is that the new order should itself be essentially democratic and not totalitarian. If labor and progressive forces fail in either respect, they will be cheated of the goal they seek.

British Labor has a chance, a better one than such forces have anywhere else in the world. But its task is colossal and the difficulties before it tremendous, many of which arise from the fact that it must seek to build a new order amid the devastations and hatreds wrought by war and that "the peace" is one already so largely determined by Churchill. In this respect my prophecy still has force. What men sow they reap—and often in tears rather than joy. It is doubtful whether the Labor Party can break with British imperialism sufficiently to enable it to share in making a genuine and lasting peace. *The Nation,* one of its staunchest friends, says editorially that the Labor Party "will not hasten to liquidate the Empire with which Britain's economic links are so close and vital." One wishes in such an hour, at the close of the most awful war in man's long history, that the Labor Party had followed George Lansbury's leadership in the 'thirties and that he or someone like him were at its head now—in place of its present "strong man," Ernest Bevin. It was Bevin who at the crucial Labor Party Conference in 1935, after Lansbury's resignation, to quote Patricia Strauss in *Bevin and Company,* published in 1941, "with saintly George Lansbury sitting with tears streaming down his face, . . . tore the pacifist case to shreds!"

Forty-nine religious and educational leaders charge our government with carrying war to "a new low of inhumanity" in—

The Use of the Atomic Bomb

The following statement was released to the press of the nation on Monday, August 20, by Dr. Paul Scherer on behalf of the entire group of signers. In the few days immediately before and after its publication a remarkable number of other individuals and groups, secular as well as religious, publicly expressed similar sentiments regarding the use of atomic power for purposes of destruction.—THE EDITORS.

WE HAVE AT LAST ACHIEVED THE ATOMIC BOMB. In the lethal race against Germany, we got there first. It was too late to try out our bomb on the Germans but there was still time to test it in the centers of two Japanese cities. It did its work thoroughly and the heart of each city is atomized and the "dead are too numerous to count."

Our nation's leaders announced this with satisfaction. We do not share this sentiment. We believe we have committed an atrocity of a new magnitude; and though technically it may not contravene the recognized rules of "civilized" warfare, in essence it violates every instinct of humanity. If it is covered by no accepted regulation that is because it is outside the entire code of human relationships.

We have repeatedly voiced our condemnation of obliteration aerial bombing. Japan was universally and rightly condemned for the bombing of Chinese cities with their civilian populations. We have descended step by step to an equally low level of moral culpability by the systematic wiping out of half a hundred Japanese cities, most of which have offered no serious defense.

But this new weapon opens new areas for our moral judgment. While we were ostentatiously announcing in advance the doom of one after another of the smaller enemy cities, and calling it mercy, we suddenly unleashed by parachute over the large city of Hiroshima, and then of Nagasaki, this "cosmic disturbance" which has dragged the war and all of us with it, to a new low of inhumanity. This new missile of two thousand times the magnitude of our attacks hitherto, was not used to save ourselves in an extremity of desperation. We cannot believe it was even essential to the defeat of Japan. Its reckless and irresponsible employment against an already virtually beaten foe will have to receive judgment before God and the conscience of humankind. It has our unmitigated condemnation.

Our own future fate is involved in this wartime use of the atomic bomb. We agree with Hanson Baldwin's comment, that "we clinched victory in the Pacific, but we sowed the whirlwind." We may have to reap not only the whirlwind of revenge and retaliation at so colossal a crime as we have committed against other human beings by its indiscriminate use; this very missile may be the instrument of our own destruction as a nation. Our President gravely assures us that the new demon will be carefully kept in control. If this means that no one else will ever obtain the formula or another effective one, or will ever obtain a specimen bomb, or will ever be able to visit our shores with one in some future conflict, we must disagree. We have now brought forth the new weapon that the world has been seeking and yet dreading. Now we shall have to take the consequences. We are grateful for the scientific achievement that lies behind this weapon, and we wish to see the new power reserved for constructive, civilian uses. The spiritual nature of man is challenged to achieve this. But, if once we legitimatize use of the Atomic Bomb for enemy destruction, no power can again bring this new death-energy within bounds.

We, therefore, with a sense of the utmost urgency protest against all further use of the atomic bomb and we respectfully ask the President to take immediate steps to discontinue its production; and, to press for commitments by all nations outlawing the atomic bomb and also war which has developed the technology of mass destruction.

PROF. ROLAND H. BAINTON, D.D.
PROF. EMILY G. BALCH
REV. A. D. BEITTEL
REV. CHARLES F. BOSS, JR.
REV. T. T. BRUMBAUGH, D.D.
REV. GEORGE A. BUTTRICK, D.D.
PROF. ROBERT F. CALHOUN, D.D.
REV. J. HENRY CARPENTER, D.D.
FRANKLIN D. COGSWELL
RABBI ABRAHAM CRONBACH, D.D.
PROF. WALTER F. DAVISON, D.D.
REV. ALBERT E. DAY, D.D.
RUSSELL L. DURGIN
REV. PHILLIPS P. ELLIOTT, D.D.
MARY FARQUHARSON
DEAN W. J. FAULKNER
PROF. GEORGIA HARKNESS, D.D.
REV. CONRAD HOFFMAN, JR., D.D.
REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, D.D.
PROF. CHARLES IGLEHART, D.D.
REV. E. STANLEY JONES, D.D.
REV. JOHN PAUL JONES
PROF. RUFUS M. JONES
BISHOP PAUL B. KERN, D.D.
REV. JOHN HOWLAND LATHROP, D.D.
PROF. KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, D.D.
PROF. HALFORD E. LUCCOCK, D.D.
REV. SAMUEL W. MARBLE, D.D.
ALFRED D. MOORE
REV. A. J. MUSTE
REV. JAMES MYERS
KIRBY PAGE
REV. ALBERT W. PALMER, D.D.
MRS. HENRY HILL PIERCE
REV. EDWIN MCNEILL POTEAT, D.D.
DOROTHY M. ROBERTS
REV. JOHN NEVIN SAYRE
REV. LUMEN J. SHAFER
REV. PAUL E. SCHERER, D.D.
PROF. WALTER W. SIKES
REV. GEORGE S. SIUDY
PROF. ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR., D.D.
REV. WINBURN T. THOMAS, D.D.
REV. ERNEST FREMONT TITTLE, D.D.
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
REV. THEODORE D. WALSER, D.D.
PROF. NORMAN J. WHITNEY
E. RAYMOND WILSON
REV. WILLIAM L. YOUNG, D.D.

French FOR Men Here

Edouard Theiss, one of our leading French FOR members, has just arrived in the United States, and Andre Trocmé is expected some time in September. Both are ordained ministers of the Protestant Church in France. They have been conducting the school at Le Chambon with the aid of contributions from the United States FOR. In maintaining faithful witness for pacifism and refusing to obey Nazi-Vichy laws which involved persecution of Jews, they were for a short time imprisoned and had to spend many months in hiding during the war. Either Edouard Theiss or Andre Trocmé will speak at the opening session of the Philadelphia Conference on Friday evening, September 21; and it is expected that Trocmé will appear at the Mid-Western and possibly also the Denver and the Pacific Coast conferences. Watch for further notice.

World Federation

A group of CPS men at Belden, California, have produced, as a result of a long series of discussions, a 16-page leaflet entitled, *Proposed Constitution for World Federation.*

The proposed Federation would have "power to define and punish crimes by individuals and corporations against the peace and welfare of citizens of the world." Within the sphere of international affairs, as outlined by the proposed constitution, the Federation would deal directly with its citizens in any country of the world.

Three legislative houses are described: a Senate consisting of two delegates from each nation, a House of Representatives consisting of one representative for each five million of population, and a Chamber of Guilds, representing major vocational categories across national lines.

Copies can be obtained from the Brethren Service Committee, 22 South State Street, Elgin, Illinois, at 5¢ each or 25 for $1.

FOR Wires President

The FOR sent the following telegram to the President:

"On behalf Fellowship of Reconciliation we respectfully but urgently request you prevent further use of atomic bomb and negotiate immediate peace in line with Japan's offer of today. Basic religious principles and American traditions and ideals are violated by atomic bomb's wholesale indiscriminate destruction of life. History will judge America according to her humanity and if the use of this device for destruction is permitted more damage will be done to our moral standing and to our self-respect than to the cities of Japan. We urge you to forbid use of bomb and to press for universal disarmament and peace."

Phillips P. Elliott, Chairman
John Nevin Sayre, Secretary

Jottings

The former Northern California secretary of the FOR, Caleb Foote, was sentenced on June 27 to a two-year prison term. He has been sent to Steilacoom, Washington.

* * *

Tartt Bell, who was an FOR field worker in the South before his induction into CPS, has become an assistant in personnel for the Brethern Service Committee in CPS. He will be on detached service.

* * *

Midwestern FOR members will want to mark on their fall calendars these dates of regional conferences: Detroit, Sept. 28-30, Central Methodist Church. Des Moines, Oct. 5-7, YWCA. St. Louis, Oct. 8-10, Centennial Methodist Church.

* * *

A resolution recently adopted by the Puerto Rico FOR group declares that Puerto Ricans in general are not satisfied with the present political status of their island, urges the U. S. to recognize at once the right of self-determination. Recognition by the U. S. of its "special responsibility for the continuing welfare of Puerto Rico's people" is urged, since much help with economic problems will be needed even if full independence is established. FOR members in the U. S. are asked to join with the Puerto Rico group "in undertaking a program of education and action" toward the attainment of the objectives set forth.

* * *

Two jobs have recently been called to our attention. A juvenile correctional institution with 500 boys, located in an eastern state, is looking for a nurse who is interested in more than professional care of patients. And a cause organization in an Eastern city is in need of a secretary. For further information, write to FELLOWSHIP.

* * *

A letter from the National Probation Association to a CO prison "graduate" says in part: "I am sure you are right that the conscientious objectors could contribute some very valuable information about the inside of our jails. Since they are in no sense representative of the run-of-the-mill jail population, their observations would be particularly helpful." The CO urges ex-prisoners throughout the country to write letters to Community and Councils, Inc., 155 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y., urging investigations of the prisons.

Approximately 60 persons attended a meeting of the New York FOR August 10-12 at Andrus Mansion, Yonkers. Purpose of the meeting was to provide a time for fellowship and recreation, and to re-examine pacifist thinking and action.

* * *

"A wonderful stream of postcards and letters came in, offering food parcels, from all parts of the country . . . from a relocation center . . . from six CPS units . . . " reports Herbert Jehle, about the project to send food to FOR friends in Europe. Increasingly, word from abroad makes clear how needed and how welcome such gifts are. For information about sending packages, write Rev. G. L. Paine, FOR office, 6 Park St., Boston, Mass.

* * *

The Spokane FOR announces the organization of Spokane Fellowship Center, an interracial co-operative house at East 17 Seventh Avenue, Spokane 10, Washington. During the next six months it will be used as a hostel for Japanese, at the same time continuing to have permanent residents living there on a co-operative basis. This six-months period will give the group an opportunity to prepare for a permanent program and to secure someone to direct it.

* * *

A Friends Student Colony, with a capacity of about eight students, will be opened at 3014 West Street, Ames, Iowa, close to the campus of Iowa State College, on September 15. The main purpose of the colony is to enable students to combine the technical advantages of a great university with the spiritual advantages of a small, religiously motivated college. It is intended mainly for students at the graduate level, but arrangements can be made in special cases for undergraduates or for special students who wish to follow independent courses of study. Those interested in joining should write to Kenneth and Elise Boulding, Department of Economics, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

* * *

Add to the record of war's "realism" England's quandary about what to do with "vast stocks of poison gas piled up and unused." *Time* says it's a seemingly insoluble problem . . . stored all over England are thousands . . . of deadly 500-pound gas bombs." To dump them in the ocean would be "messy and possibly dangerous." To bury them in a desert means "a staggering transportation problem." To convert them into useful chemicals is "much too expensive."

Atomic Bomb and War's End Complicate Conscription Picture

The summer's vast events have so jumbled the picture of peacetime conscription that anything can happen as Congress reopens. Under the headline "Draft Opposition Rising in Congress", the *N. Y. Times* on Aug. 15 told of interesting shifts by Sen. Elbert D. Thomas and Rep. Andrew J. May, chairmen of the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees and two prime pushers for conscription. May "expressed confidence in a volunteer system" and Thomas declared "it would be foolish to keep on drafting boys after the war ends." But on Aug. 16 President Truman said he would back universal military training "which was not peacetime conscription." He "declined to detail" what, if any, is the subtle difference between the two programs.

The army says 400,000 men must be kept in Europe for "an indefinite time" and there will also be long-term occupation of the Pacific. They contend this cannot be done by voluntary recruits. It is likely that they will try to push conscription through under a new cloak, as "universal training."

Yet the Army's case is archaic, according to military expert Hanson W. Baldwin in the Aug. 20 *Life*. "The atomic bomb has wrenched us violently from the moorings of the military past. It appears to have invalidated, technologically, the concept of peacetime conscription and mass armies, of giant warships and tremendous bombers . . . A commission of the nation's leading citizens should be appointed at once by the President and Congress to study the technological revolution in warfare. It would be a happy day if such a commission concluded and could persuade its fellow men that this is One World and that man must establish a common brotherhood or die in droves beneath the atomic bombs."

Alert for surprise moves by groups determined to have conscription, FOR people will want to make all possible use of these new factors in the situation and rally their forces for an intensified effort against such legislation this fall.

Committee Defends Murphy and Taylor

In two articles in the May and June (1944) *Prison World,* Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes branded the obsolutist war resisters, Stanley Murphy and Louis Taylor, as "irresponsible" and "egomaniacs."

Forthwith, seventeen men who had known the prisoners while they were in CPS formed a Facts-on-Murphy-and-Taylor Committee to probe the sources of Dr. Barnes' information and to collect evidence on the records of the two men. They assert that Murphy and Taylor, while in CPS, "had held positions of trust and responsibility; both had earned the confidence of the camp administrators, of the government foremen and project supervisors, and of their fellow conscripts; both had records of extreme thoughtfulness and consideration for others—hardly of the psychopath."

Said Dr. Barnes: "The cause of the conscientious objectors was very adversely and unfortunately affected by the whole affair since it led many outsiders wrongfully and unfairly to identify the whole body of CO's with these obvious eccentrics . . . and gave the highly erroneous notion that the objectors, as a group, are unruly, ungrateful, and a disturbing influence."

Says the committee formed for their defense: "Their stand (has) an almost legendary significance for the future of civil liberties. . . . They will take their place beside Debs, Sacco and Vanzetti, and other historic pioneers of truth and justice." The defense rests.

On August 1 both men were released from the Federal Prison Bureau Medical Center at Springfield, Mo., on completion of two and one-half year terms.

Jim Crow Prisons

At two federal prisons, Milan, Mich. and Ashland, Ky., CO's are being punished for their protests against Jim Crow practices in dining halls. Two Negro CO's started the action at Milan in April when they did not touch the food on their trays, in silent protest against being forced to eat at a segregated table. They were placed in isolation, as have been several white inmates who supported their stand.

On June 3 in Ashland eight white CO's asked the prison administration to set up a dining room arrangement where those inmates who desired to eat in interracial groups would be allowed to do so. The protesting group, now grown to 14, including three Negroes and one Japanese-American, are in isolation.

Study Civil Liberties

The Pacifist Research Bureau and Social Science Research Council are co-operating in a study of the civil liberties aspects of conscientious objection in this war. A difficult problem in this connection has been how to evaluate local Selective Service Boards. The Pacifist Research Bureau would like to have any information which CPS men might be able to furnish regarding their own local boards or the boards of others, noting particularly such points as the economic backgrounds of board members, any prejudices discovered—especially in the case of Jehovah's Witnesses, frequency with which 4-E classifications were given, and frequency with which boards summoned conscientious objectors for oral interviews. The Bureau will be happy to pay costs of postage and stationery if CPS men will report such costs. Replies should be sent to Pacifist Research Bureau, 1201 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

CO's Get Publicity

Pictures of CO's rubbing bleary eyes, yawning groggily, and drooping over chess games peppered the pages of newspapers across the country, when a fatigue experiment on 12 men from Glendora, California, CPS camp received wide publicity. The men tried to stay awake 112 hours in tests at California Institute of Technology. The press kept the country informed about every yawn and nod. At the same time, national wire services and a *Life* photographer were making a name for the 36 CPS men who were systematically starved in experiments at the University of Minnesota. Now, with "gaunt cheeks, searching eyes, emaciated bodies, and baggy clothing" which, United Press says, resemble those of Nazi prison camp survivors, the men have completed their period of starvation and are being fed experimental diets to determine the most efficient methods of bringing back to normal the starving peoples of war-mangled countries.

Two Join FOR Staff

From wide experience in youth work Hazel Brownson came this month to the FOR staff as Forerunners' secretary. She has worked in mountain-white and cotton mill communities in the Carolinas under the Congregational Home Missions Board, and for some time was a young people's editor with the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education. A graduate of Wheaton College, Mass., she also has a master's degree from Boston University. Her hobby is music and she supervised a folk song publication, *Fun and Folk Songs,* as a result of her experiences as music counselor in settlement camps. She has most recently been associated with the National Conference of Christians and Jews, where she prepared a kit of materials for use with high school people on "Making Democracy Work."

Ruth Erwin joins the FELLOWSHIP staff as an editorial assistant, coming from Chicago where she was executive secretary of the Association of Church Social Workers. There she edited *The Church Social Worker,* the official quarterly publication of the association. A graduate of East Central State Teachers College in Ada, Okla., she has been woman's page editor of a newspaper and secretary of Presbyterian churches in Oklahoma. Later she attended Presbyterian College of Christian Education, in Chicago, and for three years she was a resident at Chicago's Erie Neighborhood House, working with junior and young people's groups there.

New Books for a New Era

Read these for new insights on the problems of the post-war period

America's Place in the World **$2.75**
A refreshing and realistic facing of future alternatives by Nathaniel Peffer, of Columbia University.

The Real Soviet Russia **$3.50**
Straight facts about a confusing picture, by David Dallin, a native of Russia now on the faculty of Yale University.

What the Negro Wants **$3.50**
An important symposium by 14 American Negro leaders, edited by Rayford W. Logan. Essential reading!

The Yogi and the Commissar **$2.75**
Sixteen distinguished and able essays, including three on Soviet Russia; others on war, etc. Arthur Koestler.

Must Men Hate? **$2.50**
Sigmund Livingston's comprehensive analysis of race prejudice, especially as expressed in anti-Semitism.

The Constant Fire **$2.00**
A new book by Allan Knight Chalmers, with a vibrant message of great personal and social importance.

The Will of God for These Days **$1.00**
Kirby Page's clear and bold interpretation of the meaning of Christianity in the world's current crisis.

And these—though not so new —were never more pertinent

Religion and the World of Tomorrow **$1.50**
Walter W. Van Kirk outlines the political and economic reforms necessary to peace, but shows the need of a spiritual basis.

Say Yes to the Light **$1.50**
Allan A. Hunter's eloquent plea for men to take the teachings of Jesus seriously and apply them to life's practical problems.

New World A-Coming **$3.00**
Roi Ottley gives in this book a beneath-the-surface picture of Harlem. A Houghton Mifflin Life-in-America prize book.

A Preface to Prayer **$2.00**
Gerald Heard's encouraging interpretation of prayer as the only means by which personal and social evolution may be continued.

The Crisis of Our Age **$3.50**
Sorokin, head of Harvard's sociology department, challenges the wave of pessimism about Western civilization, and cites facts.

CONSCRIPTION

The backers of peacetime conscription are preparing for one final effort to get it through Congress this fall. Our only hope is to inform the people.

Help distribute literature—Now! Send for complete list.

International Abolition of Conscription
Swomley's timely and attractive leaflet.
25¢ per dozen—$1.50 per 100

Will Our Boys Goosestep, Too?
European and proposed U.S. systems compared.
50 for 25¢ — 250 for $1.00

Peacetime Conscription
Illustrated folder. Exposes the fallacies.
30 for $1.00—100 for $3.00

Who Wants Peacetime Conscription?
U. S. arguments compared with Hitler's.
25¢ per dozen—$1.50 per 100

Conscription After the War?
The Forerunners Studybook by Harrop and Ruth Freeman. Excellent for discussion. 25¢.

PAMPHLETS

Race Riots Aren't Necessary
A new Public Affairs Pamphlet by Alfred McClung Lee, co-author of **Race Riot**.....10¢

Clash by Night
Wallace Hamilton's prize-winning pamphlet on the significance of CPS.....25¢

We Are Accountable
Leonard Edelstein's unvarnished account of mental institutions ..... 25¢

Charter of the United Nations
Complete text of the Charter and Statute of International Court of Justice.....Free

A Working Peace System
David Mitrany's plea for functional development of international organization.....45¢

New Economics and World Peace
Robert Stevens discusses current economics in relation to war and peace.....25¢

Political Theories of Modern Pacifism
Mulford Sibley's analysis and criticism of pacifist political philosophies.....25¢

Introduction to Non-violence
Theodore Paullin's informative study of the various degrees of non-violence.....25¢

New Testament Basis of Pacifism
Macgregor's scholarly study of Jesus' teachings in relation to pacifism.....50¢

CASH WITH ORDER EXPEDITES SERVICE AND REDUCES EXPENSE—THANK YOU!

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION • 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.